Bottcher, Helen

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 11:43 PM
To: Skadowski, Suzanne
Cc: wyckoffcomments
Subject: Gander Wyckoff Comment #3

On page 4-9 of the April 2016 FFS, the following is stated:

"*For Alternatives 4 and 7, the primary implementation challenge would be the scale of ISS treatment, which would be one of the largest ISS treatment projects to date. Vertical auger mixing to depths of 55 feet and ject injection to depths of approximately 70 feet represent the upperlimit for this type of equipment, therefore, treatment rates could be slower than initially estimated.*"

Please provide the backup information that these statement is based on.
-What are the existing projects that are fairly large and serve as benchmarks for the Wyckoff site. The site(s) you are apparently referring to must have had injections of cement to 70 feet below grade and mixing to depths of 55 feet - please clarify if this is the case, or clarify that these mixing and injection depths were actually extrapolations of shallower site conditions.
-Are these benchmark sites at locations with a water table within ten feet of the ground surface?
-If they have a high water table, is that groundwater brackish?
-What are the ages of the benchmark sites and how are they performing?
-What were the stated durations of performance at these benchmark sites? If, as at Wyckoff, the EPA/contractor have chosen to be silent on estimated performance durations before the cement begins to degrade, please state as such.